



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,300	03/18/2004	Robin Edwin Buckingham	P32498C1	5722

7590 11/04/2004

GLAXOSMITHKLINE
Corporate Intellectual Property - UW2220
P.O. Box 1539
King of Prussia, PA 19406-0939

EXAMINER

WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,300

Applicant(s)

BUCKINGHAM

Examiner

Kevin E. Weddington

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/168,872.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claims 12-31 are presented for examination.

Applicant's preliminary amendment and information disclosure statement filed March 18, 2004 have been received and entered.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 10/168,872, filed on October 4, 2002.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 12-29 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 12-23 and 30-35 of copending Application No. 10/168,872.

The two applications are claiming the same invention:

Both claim 12 of the two applications: A method for the treatment of diabetes mellitus and heart failure associated with diabetes mellitus in a mammal, which method comprises administering an effective, non-toxic and pharmaceutically acceptable amount of 5-[4-[2-(N-methyl-N-(2-pyridyl)amino)ethoxy]benzyl]thiazolidine-2,4-dione, in a pharmaceutically

Art Unit: 1614

acceptable form, and an agent used in the treatment of heart failure associated with diabetes mellitus, wherein said agent is selected from the group consisting of a beta-blocker, an ACE inhibitor, a diuretic and an endothelin antagonist.

Same or identical claims 13: A method for the treatment of Type II diabetes and heart failure associated with Type II diabetes in a mammal with the same combination of agents.

Identical claims 14 the beta-blockers.

Identical claims 15 the ACE inhibitors.

Identical claims 16 the diuretic.

Identical claims 17 the heart failure is congestive heart failure.

Identical claims 18 the co-administration of the combination of the two components of the combination.

Identical claims 19 the sequential administration.

Identical claims 20 the co-administration.

Identical claims 21 the sequential administration.

Identical claims 22 the co-administration of the formulation.

Identical claims 23 the administering of the unit dosage.

Claim 24 of present application and claim 30 of the copending application the pharmaceutically acceptable form is a pharmaceutically acceptable salt.

Claim 25 of present application and claim 31 of the copending application the acceptable salt is a maleate salt.

Claim 26 of the present application and claim 32 of the copending application the pharmaceutically acceptable form is solvate form.

Claim 27 of the present application and claim 33 of copending application the acceptable form is a pharmaceutically acceptable solvate of a pharmaceutically acceptable salt form.

Claim 28 of the present application and claim 34 of the copending application the acceptable solvate is a hydrate.

Claim 29 of the present application and claim 35 of the copending application the acceptable solvate is a hydrate.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 12-39 are not allowed.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 30 and 31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 36-40 of copending Application No. 10/168,872. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present application teaches methods for the treatment of diabetes mellitus and heart failure associated with diabetes mellitus, and the treatment of Type II diabetes and heart failure associated with Type II diabetes in a mammal with a combination of pioglitazone and an agent selected from the group consisting of a beta-blocker, an ACE inhibitor, a diuretic and an endothelin antagonist. Note the present application claims are narrow with the secondary preferred agents, while the copending application claim 36 is broad towards the secondary agent of the combination.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 30 and 31 are not allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.


Claim 23 is rendered indefinite because the claim depends upon cancelled claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Claim 23 is not allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin E. Weddington whose telephone number is (571) 272-0587. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:00 am-7:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on (571) 272-0953. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Kevin E. Weddington
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614

K. Weddington
October 31, 2004